

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

SAGE HUMPHRIES, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MITCHELL TAYLOR BUTTON and
DUSTY BUTTON,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-01412-ART-EJY

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Mitchell and Dusty Buttons' Motion for Reconsideration. ECF No. 507. The Buttons contend the Court made a manifest error when it denied their previously filed Emergency Motion seeking to submit confidential documents in a Central District of California matter in which they are Plaintiffs (Case No. 8:24-cv-01730-JVS-DFM (the "California Litigation")). The Buttons argue the Court failed to recognize that their Emergency Motion addressed active litigation pending against Daryl Katz, Anthony Pellicano, and Robert Klieger, not just against defendants who had been dismissed. *Id.*

A review of the Emergency Motion demonstrates the only mention of Mr. Katz is in relation to evidence the Buttons sought to introduce in oppositions to Motions to Dismiss filed by Micah and Michael Humphries, Hannah Stolrow, and Kathryne Meyer (ECF No. 497 at 5), all of whom were dismissed from the California Litigation. ECF No. 505 at 1. Further, the docket in the California Litigation shows Mr. Katz has not been served; thus, there is no active litigation pending against him. Finally, the contents of the Emergency Motion confirms neither Mr. Pellicano nor Mr. Klieger were ever mentioned by the Buttons. ECF No. 497. Facts and arguments raised for the first time in a reply brief need not be addressed by the Court. *Zamani v. Carnes*, 491 F.3d 990, 997 (9th Cir. 2007). Thus, the contention that the Court committed a manifest error when failing to address litigation pending against Messrs. Katz, Pellicano, and Klieger is simply wrong.

1 Finding no manifest error or any other basis for reconsideration, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED
2 that Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 507) is DENIED.

3 Dated this 5th day of July, 2025.

4 
5
6 ELAYNA J. YOUCHAK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE